DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 807 FL 027 493

AUTHOR	Munoz, Marco A.
TITLE	High Stakes Accountability Environments: Its Impact on the Administration of English Language Learners Programs.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (Washington, DC, November 6-10, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Accountability; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Federal Legislation; *High Stakes Tests; Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; *Program Administration; Public Education; Second Language Learning; Standardized Tests; State Standards; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Kentucky

ABSTRACT

Throughout the 1990s, legislation increasingly required programs receiving federal funding to be more accountable for what they did. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 further emphasized the levels of accountability to ensure student success in schools. For limited English proficient (LEP) education, these requirements have intensified the debate among practitioners, researchers, and policy makers as to what constitutes success and how to measure it. A conceptualization of administration effectiveness based on student results in standardized achievement tests provided the theoretical framework for this study. The purpose of the analysis was to explore accountability issues in LEP education. A case study of a local educational agency is presented to exemplify the impact of the high stakes testing environment on LEP program administration. Overall, findings indicate that incorporating accountability mechanisms provides an avenue for understanding LEP education program administration, and it is an issue that needs to be addressed by policy makers and administrators at the school district level. Implications for educational administration and policymaking are examined. (Contains 33 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

High Stakes Accountability Environments

ED 470 807

High Stakes Accountability Environments: Its Impact on the Administration of English Language Learners Programs

Marco A. Muñoz

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marco A. Munoz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (AEA), November 6-10, 2002, Washington, DC.

FL027493

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Throughout the 1990s, legislation increasingly required programs receiving federal funding to be more accountable for what they do. Currently, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 further emphasized the levels of accountability to ensure student success in schools. For Limited English Proficient (LEP) education, these requirements have intensified the debate among practitioners, researchers, and policy makers as to what constitutes success and how to measure it. A conceptualization of administration effectiveness based on student results in standardized achievement tests provided the theoretical framework for this study. The purpose of this analysis was to explore accountability issues in LEP education. A case study of a local educational agency is presented to exemplify the impact of the high stake-testing environment on LEP program administration. Overall findings indicated that incorporating accountability mechanisms provide an avenue for understanding of LEP education program administration and it is an issue that needs to be addressed by policy makers and administrators at the school district level. Implications for educational administration and policymaking are examined and discussed.

Keywords: Accountability; Educational Change; High Stakes Tests; Language Proficiency; Limited English Speaking; Outcome Based Education; School Effectiveness; Second Language Instruction; Academic Achievement; Educational Policy

High Stakes Accountability Environment: Its Impact on the Administration of English Language Learners Programs

Legal Framework

Since 1960s, federal legislation has addressed the issue of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in the operation of all federally-assisted programs. Under this law, schools must provide any alternative language program necessary to ensure that national origin minority students with LEP have meaningful access to the schools' program. In the 1970s, Lau versus Nichols Supreme Court Decision established the fact that a school cannot claim to provide equal access to LEP students by providing them with the same services provided to other children (Nuttall, 1984). The Supreme Court ruled that San Francisco schools had discriminated against Chinese students (Walling, 1993).

In the 1980s, Castaneda versus Pickard Supreme Court Decision established three standards for determining compliance with Title VII (currently Title III) regulations. The three part approach includes (a) soundness of educational approach, (b) proper implementation, and (c) program evaluation necessary to ensure that language minority students with LEP have meaningful access to schools' programs.

Throughout the 1990s, legislation increasingly required programs receiving federal funding to be more accountable for what they do. Currently, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 further emphasizes the levels of accountability to ensure student success in schools. For Limited English Proficient (LEP) education, these requirements

have intensified the debate among practitioners, researchers, and policy makers as to what constitutes success and how to measure it.

Finally, the new federal legislation has put the language minority students at center stage. On January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The Act is the most sweeping reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since ESEA was enacted in 1965. It redefines the federal role in K-12 education and will help close the achievement gap between disadvantaged and minority students and their peers. The limited language proficient students are one of the critical groups for which assessment of yearly progress and data disaggregation is required by law. By 2014, the federal government has set targets for school districts across the nation. The plan aims to help LEP students master English by streamlining bilingual programs, establishing performance objectives, sanctioning poor performance, and increasing instructional flexibility (Bush, 2001).

At the same time, the number of English language learners enrolled in LEP education programs has been growing, particularly in areas of the country that have not previously seen many immigrants. New programs are being established to meet the demand for English as a second language (LEP) instruction, and existing programs are expanding. School districts are reporting increases in LEP student enrollments of 10-25% in the last decade; by contrast, the overall student population increased by approximately one percent annually (Anstrom, 1996).

According to Takaki (1993), it is estimated that by the year 2056 most Americans will trace their descent to almost everywhere but white Europe. In this regard, the needs of the LEP are now considered a priority across the nation public schools. Language

minority students are expected to become mainstream, but educators are not prepared to deal with instructional requirements of diverse learners. Collaboration is a must (Fradd, 1992).

Accountability in Education

The move toward greater accountability in education has been one of the hallmarks since the 1970s in public education (Rich, 1985). Since 1974, Levin has argued that performance accountability is concerned with educational outputs. Levin (1974) defined performance accountability as "a periodic report of the attainments of schools and other educational units" (p. 364). Performance reporting includes such measurement techniques as statewide assessments, school report cards, and performance indicators. The overall objective of a performance accountability system is to provide a standard upon which a school can compare its own progress over time. The end results should (a) stimulate actions to improve education, (b) monitor regulatory compliance for state requirements, and (c) produce rewards as well as sanctions to schools (Kirst, 1990).

Accountability is generally conceived as a demand to judge schools by their outputs. Schools are expected to make wise use of public resources not only by efficient cost accounting procedures but also by raising test scores. Accountability systems have been designed to track the progress of educational reforms. The function of an accountability system in education is to monitor and evaluate the performance of the education system as a whole and the individual school's achievement (Wohlstetter, 1991).

Accountability and outcome-based education is a culminating demonstration of learning. In that sense, outcome-based education focuses on identifying and defining

specified educational results and teaching toward them (Ellis & Fouts, 1994). Clarity of focus means that all curriculum design, instructional delivery, and assessment is geared to what the students should learn at the end of their time in schools. The expectation is that all students should be able to learn significant curriculum in schools; this means expanding the ways and number of times students get a chance to learn. Clarity of focus, expanded opportunity, high expectations, and design curriculum backward became the four defining principles of an outcome-based education (Brandt, 1993).

To satisfy the educational responsibilities of a democratic society, public education must demonstrate that each student is provided with adequate levels of knowledge and skills. According to educational experts, educational outcomes can no longer be measured only in quantity (e.g., years of schooling and the number of high school diplomas granted). Schools must guarantee that education has a demonstrably positive effect on students.

> Schools must show that students benefit from their years of attendance, that increased investment in schooling can be measured in greater ability to read, write, and do mathematics, and that moving up the academic ladder from grade to grade is based on merit rather than on social promotion. (Nelson, Palonsky, & Carlson, 1990, p. 286)

The members of the accountability movement believed that answers to qualitative questions must be based on hard data. Schools needed quantifiable measures of student performance and teacher effectiveness if accountability was to be implemented. Intelligent policy decisions should be based on objective information, and although no

single means of data collection is sufficient, the data generated by well-designed standardized tests are crucial to an understanding of school outcomes.

According to Nelson, Palonsky, and Carlson (1990), testing became the scientific basis for making decisions about the quality of schools to produce academic learning by students. Testing became the yardstick against which society charted the progress and shortcomings of education, and became the form in which schools reported the status of public education to public officials and parents. Impressionistic data was not sufficient and anecdotal data was not "scientific." Standardized achievement tests became the objective measures of performance. The accountability era had entered into public education and was here to stay until today.

The conceptualization of equity as access to knowledge is a powerful strategy to improve education to all students, especially for those students with whom the educational system have been the least successful in the past. As an important outcome of this theoretical approach, Murphy (1988) developed the third-generation conceptualization of equity: equity as student opportunity to learn (i.e., the first-generation focused on equity as access and the second-generation focused on equity as process).

Significant policy changes have to be framed by the conceptualization of equity as excellence in the accountability educational reform era. Under the conceptualization of accountability as performance, output educational indicators are used to track and evaluate school and teacher effectiveness based on student results. Policy-makers have to refocus the educational reform efforts in general, and the educational excellence issues in specific, toward results in student achievement.

High Stakes Assessment

Programs are required to report the percentage of learners that move from level to level during the funding year. Given that it takes several years to learn a language well (Thomas & Collier, 1997), such information is crucial in high-stakes assessment. The time it takes to show level gain on a proficiency scale is dependent on both program and learner factors. Program factors include intensity of the classes (e.g., how long and how many times per week); training and experience of the instructors (e.g., LEP certification); adequacy of facilities (e.g., adequate lighting); and, resources available to both instructors and learners (e.g., technology). Learner factors include degree of literacy in native language, age, and opportunities to use the language outside of instructional time. Stakeholders need to know under what conditions (with which combinations of learner and program factors) proficiency level gains are achievable.

One way to test language development is through the use of standardized tests, which are developed according to explicit specifications. Test items are chosen for their ability to discriminate among levels, and administration procedures are consistent and uniform. Pencil-and-paper standardized tests are often used because they are easy to administer to groups, require minimal training for the test administrator, and have documentation of reliability (consistency of results over time) and validity (measuring what the test says it measures). Appendix A presents a list of standardized instruments that are commonly used to assess English language proficiency.

Despite the advantages, standardized tests have limitations. Their results will have meaning to learners and teachers only if the test content is related to the goals and content of the instruction (Van Duzer & Berdan, 1999). LEP programs are often tailored to take

advantage of the few hours (typically 4-8 hours per week) that learners are available for pull out study. Instruction may focus on a limited number of learner goals (e.g., core content for assessment). If the items in a standardized test reflect the actual curriculum, then the test may accurately assess achievement of the learners. However, if the items do not reflect what is covered in the classroom, the test may not adequately assess what learners know and can do.

There is concern, however, that standardized tests may not be able to capture the incremental changes in learning that occur over short periods of instructional time. Test-administration manuals usually recommend the minimum number of hours of instruction that should occur between pre- and post-testing, yet the learning that takes place within that time frame is dependent on the program and learner factors discussed previously. In the effort to make sure that learners are tested and counted before they leave, program staff may be post-testing before adequate instruction has been given. In such cases, learners may not show enough progress to advance a level unless they pre-tested near the high end of the score ranges for a particular proficiency level.

Another way of assessing is using performance assessments. Performance assessments require learners to use prior knowledge and recent learning to accomplish tasks that demonstrate what they know and can do. There is a direct link between instruction and assessment. Examples of performance assessment tasks include oral or written reports (e.g., on how to become a citizen); projects (e.g., researching, producing, and distributing a booklet on recreational opportunities available in the community); and exhibitions or demonstrations (e.g., a poster depicting the steps to becoming a U.S. citizen). A variety of performance assessments provide a more complete picture of a

learner's abilities than can be gathered from performance on a pencil-and-paper standardized test.

For LEP children, but especially for LEP adults, performance assessment reflects some current thought about second language acquisition: Learners acquire language as they use it in social interactions to accomplish purposeful tasks (e.g., finding information). The performance may be assessed simply by documenting the successful completion of the task or by the use of rubrics designed to assess various dimensions of carrying out the task (e.g., rating oral presentation skills on a scale of 1-5). Both instructors and learners can be involved in the development of evaluation guidelines and in the evaluation procedure itself (Van Duzer & Berdan, 1999).

Although performance assessments provide valuable information to learners, instructors, and other program staff, their use for accountability purposes is currently limited. These types of assessment are time consuming to administer and score. To produce the reliable, quantifiable data required for high stakes assessment, performance assessments would need to be standardized. That is, for each of the proficiency functioning levels, tasks would need to be developed (and agreed upon) that would represent level completion; scoring rubrics and guidelines for evaluating performance would need to be in place; and administrators and evaluators would need to be trained.

State and Local Educational Agency Context

Kentucky is not an exception to the trend at the national level in terms of the number of LEP students. As of 2000, one third of the 176 school districts in the state had students who came from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (approximately 4000 students who are speakers of over 70 different languages. One urban school district

has the largest number of LEP students in a single district (2000 students) with speakers of over 41 languages. In this particular urban district, several new English as a Second Language (LEP) sites have been opened to accommodate the growing number of this student population, including more than 40 LEP certified teachers and more than 40 bilingual associate instructors.

In 1990, the state of Kentucky mandated a complete restructuring of the public elementary and secondary system. The current main parts of the state educational and testing system include (a) the core content, (b) core content tests, and (c) accountability. The first element, the state core content is a document that describes what students should know and be able to do in each grade. It sets high standards for students and helps the teachers plan instruction. The state core content tests measure how well students have mastered the core content; it measures how well the schools, teachers, and students are meeting the high standards set by the state with the input of multiple stakeholders.

Students also take a national basic skills test (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills); this national basic skills test allows for the comparison of the achievement of the state students with the attainment of students throughout the nation. The set of tests are given every year in every school to measure the academic progress of their students. The tests use multiple-choice, essay-like questions, and writing samples to measure how well students know a subject and what they can do with what they know. Finally, the accountability piece, is the way of using all the test scores and some other non-cognitive measures to tell schools, parents, and taxpayers how well each school is performing. The non-cognitive measures include dropout rates, attendance figures, retention rates, and successful transition to adult life.

The cognitive and non-cognitive dimensions make up the formula for school improvement. This helps schools to keep on continuously improving. Schools that perform well on the tests often receive rewards; on the other hand, schools that do not achieve as well, normally receive additional support such as highly skilled educators and scholastic audits to identify needs to help them perform better. Falling below an "assistance line" on their growth chart identifies the lowest performing schools.

The district under study is among the 30th largest school districts in the United States. The school district serves more than 96,000 students from preschool to grade 12. The school district has a vision for long-term student achievement. The school district vision, entitled "Beyond 2000," was designed to assure that every student would acquire the fundamental academic and life skills necessary for success in the classroom and workplace. The vision commits the school system to educate each student to the highest academic standards.

In summary, the state's public school system holds schools accountable for continued progress. Under this system, each school will have a customized growth chart to show the level of student achievement that is expected each year until the year 2014. Schools are expected to have a score of 100 on a scale that goes from zero to 140 by the year 2014. The population targets of the program are schools facing challenges in term of student achievement as measured by the accountability testing system.

Language Proficiency Defined

Language proficiency has been variously defined as consisting of input-output, receptive and productive skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. These are the principal skills used to categorize students as Non-English, Limited, and Fluent speakers.

There is a strong relationship between oral language proficiency and academic performance (De Avila, Cervantes, & Duncan, 1978). Subsequently, Cummins (1984) showed that the quality of first language development was directly associated with "readiness" for mainstream schooling.

Currently, there is little doubt that language proficiency is in itself important in the development of school success. Some researchers have found oral language development as a predictor of subsequent success in learning to read (Snow et al, 1998). In fact, knowing that a student is linguistically proficient means that he/she is able to benefit from instruction in the language of the classroom.

Language proficiency needs to be tested. Testing for purposes of accountability has played a significant role in education in the last decades. The use and mastery of language is critical for school success. For instance, language acquisition in early childhood provides the basis for all subsequent psychosocial and educational development. If language proficiency is not assessed, it will affect other dimensions of learning (Spolsky, 1992).

LEP Programs

LEP programs focuses on teaching students English using a variety of instructional strategies to convey academic content in the absence of native language teaching (Walling, 1993). LEP teachers provide instruction for groups of students from mixed language background in the same classroom.

In most cases, students who enroll in an LEP program belong to one of the following categories: (a) refugees, (b) immigrants or (c) foreign exchange students. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), refugees are people who flee

their home country in fear of their lives and their families. Their destinies are linked to international politics and they may wait for months or years in refugee camps before they are sent somewhere else. CAL defines immigrants as those people who also come from another country, but they make a conscious decision to leave their native land or may change their mind altogether about emigrating. Foreign exchange students come to a new country in order to learn more about its people and to improve or learn English; in most cases, they stay no longer than a year.

Upon entering a school in the United States, these types of students will face a variety of difficulties which they will have to overcome to adapt to the new environment. The most common factor that affects LEP students learning is the linguistic isolation. The older the student, the longer it usually takes to acquire the language.

One of the main goals of an LEP program is to teach students English. Key elements include maintaining and producing academic progress, providing for the students integration into the mainstream of school, and validating and preserving the students' native language and culture (Walling, 1993). Some LEP students need to acquire "school skills" as well, particularly refugee youngsters, whose schooling may have been interrupted for a prolonged period of time or may never have attended a school. In addition, parent involvement is an integral part of a successful LEP program. Involving parents of LEP students is important not only for their academic success, but also for supporting the family's integration into a larger society and for validating their native language and culture.

LEP Program Restructuring and Evaluation

Based on the literature review and on the need to evaluate the LEP services, a study was conducted to assess the impact of high stakes-testing environments on restructuring LEP program administration. The hypothesis is that the high-stakes testing environment is having an impact on how the existing LEP programs are restructured. Elements that will be discussed include (a) the organizational structure, (b) the database management operations, (c) English language proficiency assessment, (d) instructional alignment with statewide core content for assessment, (e) professional development activities, (f) involvement of academically at-risk LEP students with safety net programs, and (g) alignment of LEP proficiency measures with statewide assessment.

In the context of high-stake testing environments, LEP programs are being restructured in several ways. Dimensions included in this kind of efforts include (a) organizational structures, (b) database management operations, (c) English language proficiency testing, (d) instructional alignment with statewide core content for assessment, (e) professional development activities, (f) support for academically at-risk students, (g) alignment of LEP proficiency tests with statewide measures, and (h) program evaluation endeavors.

Organizational Structure. A clear articulation with district' goals, objectives, and indicators is required like never before. The program director needs to ensure that all staff involved in the LEP services understands the requirement of the high stake environment. Certified teachers and bilingual associate instructors work directly with the LEP students. A new element has been added to support the work of the teachers, that is, the resource teachers and the data management technicians. The resource teachers provide content and

pedagogical support to teachers while ensuring alignment with the core content for assessment. The data management technicians assist with the database operations.

Database Management Operations. At the district and the program office levels, a database administrator is needed. Relational databases at the district level are of particular importance, given the need to keep current key variables such as demographic, cognitive, and non-cognitive measures of students. Examples of demographic variables include, among others, a unique student identification number, race, gender, age, country of origin, home language, family structure (i.e., single or dual family). Examples of cognitive variables include language proficiency test scores, diagnostic test scores, and achievement test scores. Non-cognitive measures include attendance, suspensions, and dropout/graduation status.

English Language Proficiency Assessment. The identification and adoption of a LEP assessment instrument is a requirement of the high stakes testing environment, especially in the new No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (i.e., adequate yearly progress). Frequently used English proficiency tests include (a) the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), (b) the Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey, and (c) IDEA Language Proficiency Tests (IPT). These assessment help to identify the student that need LEP services, offer useful information to the teachers, and help to monitor progress toward fluency in English (i.e., oral, reading, writing). Appendix A presents more information about these commonly used language proficiency assessment instruments.

Instructional Alignment with the Statewide Core Content for Assessment. Across the nation, core content for assessment guides have been developed by state educational agencies. These guides help to ensure that curriculum topics and sequences align with the

statewide assessment instruments. LEP instruction is now being, more than ever, aligned with these assessment guides. The assessment guides or "curriculum maps" address week 1 to week 36 for all subject areas and all grade levels. This document has proved particularly valuable when used for the ESL pull out system. A strong association between the regular and the ESL class instruction is established by the common use of this document.

Professional Development Activities. As might seem evident at this point, the professional development activities are now aligned with the core content for assessment. Preeminence in this kind of activities is given to cognitive-related topics associated with the core content for assessment. In this area, content specialists and resource teachers collaborate to ensure a professional development that is (a) job embedded, (b) collegial, (c) data-driven, (d) sustained, and (e) result-oriented. In many cases, regular and ESL teachers are not differentiated in the training. Often, however, ESL teachers provide training to the regular teachers to make them more sensitive to the learning needs of minority language population.

Involvement with Safety Net Programs. The first step is the development of identification mechanisms for academically at-risk LEP students. One example is the Individual Learning Plans (ILP). The ILP help identify the areas of strengths and weaknesses of the students. It is the vital link between the regular school hours instruction and the after school activities. Once an ILP is written, supplemental educational services are provided to the student either at their local school or at their neighborhood. At the same time, in occasions, literacy programs are also offered to the

parents of the students. This is very valuable if we think about the well-know effectiveness of the two-generation approaches (see Head Start research for more details).

Alignment of LEP Measures with Statewide Assessment. The LAS, IPT, and Woodcock-Munoz assessment instruments need to be correlated to the particular state and district wide testing instruments. A high correlation with standardized achievement tests is helpful as well. The importance of this kind of concurrent and predictive validity exercises is that it ensures that the language minority instruments are correlated with the "ultimate" test, that is, the statewide assessment instruments. In the best scenario, the score of the language proficiency test should be a strong predictor of student success on the high stakes accountability tests used at the particular state educational agency.

Routine Use of Program Evaluation Findings. Program evaluation findings assist program director and other key stakeholders for (a) improvement of programs and activities (i.e., process evaluation), (b) to determine effectiveness (i.e., product or outcome evaluation), and (c) in determining whether or not to continue funding for specific programs and activities (i.e., cost-efficiency evaluation).

In this domain, it has become evident that some characteristics are starting to emerge: (a) evaluation model or approach (managerial-oriented); (b) evaluation type (quantitative-oriented); (c) evaluation focus (outcome-oriented); and, (d) evaluation variables (test-oriented). In the high stake testing environments, the managerial-oriented evaluation take preeminence. In the standardized testing environment, quantitative, impact-oriented approaches take dominance than qualitative, process-oriented approaches. The bottom line is test scores results for students, classrooms, and schools.

Discussion

The high-stakes testing environment is having an impact on how the existing LEP programs are restructured. Elements that were discussed include (a) the organizational structure, (b) the database management operations, (c) English language proficiency assessment, (d) instructional alignment with statewide core content for assessment, (e) professional development activities, (f) involvement of academically at-risk LEP students with safety net programs, and (g) alignment of LEP proficiency measures with statewide assessment.

Language proficiency has been tested for accountability purposes and has played a significant role in education in the last decades. This is becoming even more important in light of the recent legislation. On January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The Act is the most sweeping reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since ESEA was enacted in 1965. It redefines the federal role in K-12 education and will help close the achievement gap between disadvantaged and minority students and their peers. It is based on four basic principles: stronger accountability for results, increased flexibility and local control, expanded options for parents, and an emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work.

The use and mastery of language is critical for school success. We are coming to a time when determining effective LEP teaching is becoming a problem for educational research. New approaches have been developed in the last decade, especially in the area of developments in using student achievement data. Using student assessment data in the

evaluation of school performance has become a major theme in the educational research community. Nevertheless, questions remain unanswered. Until LEP students have reached a certain level of English language proficiency, it remains inappropriate for achievement tests in English to be used for student and school district performance accountability. In this case, efforts of the state should be focused on facilitating an appropriate time line for LEP students to reach minimum levels of proficiency. This is the open debate.

In the value-added framework, an effective LEP program is defined as a program that causes student improvement on core content educational outcomes such as oral, reading, and writing. The central objective of identifying effective teachers becomes one of establishing legitimate predictions of student performance and comparing those predictions to actual student outcomes (Millman, 1997). Further research needs to address the gains in English language proficiency at the school and at the classroom level. Also, future research needs to analyze the gains on students coming from different home languages. Finally, the expected gains could be compared with actual gains to address the challenges of the value-added education framework (Millman, 1997).

Further research needs to address the implications for evaluation theory, practice, and policy-making of the high stakes environment for special populations such as LEP students. In addition, more studies need to address the relationship between English Language proficiency and academic achievement. Empirical studies need to address the relationship between levels of English language proficiency and performance on state-mandated assessment measures by subject areas and by duration of LEP services.

References

Anstrom, K. (1996). *Federal policy, legislation, and education reform: The promise and challenge of language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Brandt, R. (1993). On outcome-based education: A conversation with Bill Spady. *Educational Leadership*, 50, 66-70.

Bush, G. W. (2001). *No Child Left Behind.* Washington, DC: US Department of Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447608.

Cummins, J. (2000). Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students. In C. J. Ovando and P. McLaren (Eds.)., *The politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education: Student and teachers caught in the cross fire* (pp. 126-147). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cummins, J. (1999). *BICS and CALP: Clarifying the distinction.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED438551

Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism, language proficiency and metalinguistic development. In P. Homel et al. (Eds.), *Child bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic cognitive and social development.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Davies, A. (1978). Language testing. *Language Teaching and Linguistic Abstracts, 2(3),* 220-315.

Davies, A. (1990). *Principles of language testing.* Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

De Avila, E. A., Cervantes, R. A., & Duncan, S. E. (1978). Bilingual exit criteria. *CABE Research Journal,* 1(2).

De Avila, E. A., & Duncan, S. E. (2000). *PreLAS 2000 English and Spanish: Technical notes.* Monterey, CA: McGraw-Hill.

De Avila, E. A., & Duncan, S. E. (1990). *Language assessment scales oral: Technical report.* Monterey, CA: MacMillan McGraw-Hill.

Duncan, S. E., & De Avila, E. A. (1988). *Language assessment scales reading and writing: Technical report.* Monterey, CA: MacMillan McGraw-Hill.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act "No Child Left Behind" (2002). PL 107-110.

Ellis, A.K., & Fouts, J.T. (1994). *Research on school restructuring*. Princeton, NJ: The Library of Innovations.

Fradd, S. H. (1992). *Collaboration in Schools Serving Students with Limited English Proficiency and Other Special Needs*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED352847

Kirst M. (1990). *Accountability: Implications for state and local policymakers.* Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education.

Lau vs. Nichols (1974). U.S. Supreme Court Decision. 414 US 563

Levin, H. (1974). A conceptual framework for accountability in education. *School Review*, 82, 363-391.

Millman, J. *Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Minami, M. & Ovando, C. J. (1995). Language issues in multicultural contexts. In J. A. Banks and C. A. Banks (Eds.)., *Handbook of Research in Multicultural Education* (pp. 427-444). New York: MacMillan.

Murphy, J. (1988). Equity as student opportunity to learn. *Theory Into Practice*, 27, 145-151.

Nelson, J.L., Palonsky, S.B., & Carlson, K. (1990). *Critical issues in education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nuttall, E. V. (1984). A critical look at testing and evaluation from a cross-cultural perspective. In Chinn, P. (Ed.) *Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children.* ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256103

Ovando, C. J. (2001). Language diversity and education. In J. A. Banks and C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.)., *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 268-291). New York: Wiley.

Rich, J.M. (1985). *Innovations in education: Reformers and their critics.* Boston: Allyn.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Spolsky, B. (1992). Diagnostic testing revisited. In E. Shohamy & R. A. Walton (Eds.), *Language Assessment and Feedback: Testing and Other Strategies* (pp. 29-39). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Co.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1999). Evaluation that informs school reform programs for language minority students. Montreal, Canada: American Educational Research Association.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: George Mason University. Available on-line at: ncbe.gwu.edu

Van Duzer, C., & Berdan, R. (1999). Perspectives on assessment in adult ESOL instruction. In J. Comings, B. Garner, & C. Smith (Eds.), *The annual review of adult learning and literacy* (pp. 200-242). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walling, D. R. (1993). *English as a Second Language*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356653

Wohlstetter, P. (1991). Accountability mechanism for state education reform: Some organizational alternatives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 13, 31-48.

Appendix A

English Language Proficiency Instruments

	Language Assessment Scales	**IDEA Language Proficiency Tests**	**Woodcock-Munoz Language Survey**
Purposes and Ages Assessed	Assesses language ability and proficiency from pre-K through adult in oral, reading, and writing proficiency. The LAS is designed to provide information to make placement for instructional services decisions, monitor student progress, and reclassify a student's level of language proficiency.	Assesses oral, reading, and writing for students pre-K to adult. The IPT is designed to assist in identifying LEP students and determine a student's level of language proficiency, determine eligibility for services, and reclassifying students for instruction in the mainstream classrooms.	Assesses oral proficiency, reading, and writing for pre-K to adult students. The WMLS measures Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The instrument is designed to classify student's language proficiency, assist teachers, and provide program effectiveness information.
Content Measured	LAS-Oral LAS-Reading LAS-Writing	Oral Proficiency Reading Proficiency Writing Proficiency	Language Survey
Administration	Oral is individually administered. Reading and Writing can be administered in small groups.	Oral is individually administered. Reading and Writing can be administered in small groups.	The Language Survey is individually administered.
Designations for Proficiency	LAS-Oral: (1) Non Speaker, (2-3) Limited Speaker, (4-5) Fluent Speaker. LAS-Reading and Writing: (1) Non-Literate, (2) Limited Literate, and (3) Competent Literate.	Oral: (1) Non Speaker, (2) Limited Speaker, (3) Fluent Speaker. LAS-Reading and Writing: (1) Non Reader/Writer, (2) Limited Reader/Writer, and (3) Competent Reader/Writer.	Level 1, Negligible English CALP; Level 2, Very Limited English CALP; Level 3, Limited English CALP; Level 4, Fluent English CALP; Level 5, Advanced English CALP.
Publisher	CTB McGraw-Hill	Ballard and Tighe	Riverside Publishing

FL027493

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: High Stakes Accountability Environments	
Author(s): Marco A. Munoz	
Corporate Source: Jefferson County Public Schools	Publication Date: 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Marco Munoz	Printed Name/Position/Title: Marco Munoz
Organization/Address: 3332 Newburg Rd Louisville, KY 40218	Telephone: FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Date:

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)